

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/662,818	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SHELP ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Harry D. Wilkins, III	<b>Art Unit</b> 1742	

**All Participants:**

(1) Harry D. Wilkins, III.

(2) Anthony Asquith.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 5 September 2006

**Time:** 12 noon

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*none*

**Claims discussed:**

*1, 26, 27*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*none*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed approval for the attached Examiner's amendments to the claims. Elements 16 and 18 in claim 1 were substantial duplicates of each other. Elements 13 and 15 in claim 26 were substantial duplicates of each other. Also discussed that use claims 13 and 14 and procedure claim 27 would also be examined since they depend from, and thus require, all of the features of the allowed apparatus claims..